REMARKS

Favorable reconsideration of the above-identified application is requested in view of the following remarks.

As set forth above, independent Claims 1, 10, 16 and 19 have been amended. Thus, Claims 1, 4 and 6-23 are still pending.

The Official Action rejects Claims 1, 4, 6, 9-13 and 16-19 as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 3,113,520, hereinafter *Hirata*, in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,448,376, hereinafter *Ohta*.

Claims 1 and 19 define combinations including features that are generally related to image forming apparatus comprising a first memory for storing image data, a second memory for storing image forming conditions, and printing of the image data that is stored in the first memory under the image forming conditions stored in the second memory. Claim 10 generally defines a combination of features related to an image forming apparatus comprising an image reader for reading and acquiring image data of the original, an image memory for storing the image data acquired by the image reader, a mode memory for storing image forming conditions selected for the acquired image data, and a printer for printing an image on paper, based on the image data stored in the image memory, under the image forming conditions stored in the mode memory. Claim 16 defines an image forming method comprising storing image data in an image memory, and storing image forming conditions for the image data in a memory, printing an image on paper, based on the image data stored in the image memory, under the image forming conditions stored in the memory.

Another feature generally defined by Claims 1, 10 and 19 is directed toward the outputting of image data that is newly input after discarding image data from the

first memory under the maintained image forming conditions. Claim 16 defines printing of a new image on paper, based on the new image data acquired after the discarding of image data from the image memory, under the image forming conditions maintained in the memory.

As amended above, Claims 1, 10, 16 and 19 further define that the image forming conditions are selected from the group consisting of: number of copies, magnification, and paper size.

The primary reference upon which the Examiner relies, *Hirata*, discloses a data processor that is adaptable to either an electronic typewriter or a word processor. As described by *Hirata*, a problem arises when a word processor simultaneously executes a text editing process and a printing process. The text editing process involves key code being input from a keyboard and stored in an input memory, and the printing process outputs the data stored in the input memory to a printer. When the two processes occur simultaneously, the key code data is temporarily stored in a key buffer and a lag develops between the keying of data and the displaying of data on the screen. Therefore, one of the main purposes of *Hirata* is to provide a data processor in which the process of inputting data (displaying on screen) is preferred to the outputting of print data to a printing device when data is inputted to the processor. As described beginning in column 2, line 11 of *Hirata*, a user inputs character data via a keyboard 10, and a CPU 30 is provided and executes the text editing process in accordance with a program saved on ROM 90. The CPU is also connected to RAM 40 that includes a key buffer 41 in which the key code data is stored from the keyboard controller 20. The characters generated by typing on the keyboard are saved in the key buffer 41 and together form text files

that are saved in the text memory 47. A print data memory 45 stores plural text files or a specified page of a text file that is selected from the text files stored in the text memory 47. The keyboard includes not only character keys, but also text editing start and end keys 12, 13, print reservation start and end keys 14, 15, a page printing key 16, an index key 17, a print execute key 18, and a print cancel key 19, which are operated to control the printing of the text files. Printing is carried out by a type wheel, a printing hammer, and a printing ribbon which are provided on a carriage moving along a platen, as is know in the art of typewriters.

Hirata is relied upon for a disclosure of the above-noted features, except those related to outputting of image data that is newly input after discarding image data from the first memory. For this, *Ohta* is relied upon.

Ohta discloses an image processing apparatus for automatically deleting an undesired image from an image of a document that is scanned. As described in column 1, lines 11-13 of *Ohta*, the apparatus is applicable to digital copiers and facsimile machines dealing with digital input/output image data. Basically, when an original document having either punched holes or staples is scanned, the images of the holes or staples are present in the scanned image, which is undesirable. Thus, *Ohta* provides a device and method wherein the undesired images (holes or staples) are automatically deleted from the stored image of a document and the resulting stored image (original minus deleted portion) is printed (column 1, lines 37-41).

The above-noted rejections should be withdrawn at least because it would not have been obvious to modify *Hirata* in view of *Ohta*. *Hirata* discloses technology relating to typewriters or word processors having character/text data produced by a keyboard 10 that is printed with a type wheel (column 3, lines 4-6), i.e., pure text

data. In contrast, *Ohta's* disclosure relates to image data produced by a scanner, and removing images of punched holes or staples present in original scanned document data. Therefore, the two technologies are not compatible or combinable.

Also, the two disclosures address totally different issues. *Hirata* addresses the problem of the "lag time" between typing key code and displaying key code, while *Ohta* addresses the unsightly inclusion of images of holes or staples in a scanned document image. Therefore, a skilled person would not look toward *Ohta* (relating to images of punched holes or staples) for suggestions of how to modify and improve *Hirata's* disclosure (character/text data printed with a type wheel), and it would not have been obvious to combine the two references.

Merely for argument sake, even if the above-noted references were properly combined, as suggested, *Ohta* does not disclose that for which it is relied upon in the Official Action, i.e., outputting of image data newly input from the image input unit after the discarding of image data from a first memory under maintained image forming conditions. Rather, *Ohta* discloses deleting an unwanted image (hole or staple) from the original scanned image, and then outputting the original scanned image minus the deleted portion. In column 2, lines 3-6 *Ohta* states that "it is possible to automatically delete an undesirable image from the image of a document with a staple being scanned, and output only the actual image of the document" (emphasis added). Clearly, *Ohta* does not include at least outputting of image data newly input, and the combination of *Hirata* and *Ohta* does not make Claims 1, 10, 16 and 19 obvious.

Moreover, the proposed combination of *Hirata* and *Ohta* would not have disclosed or suggested the claimed combinations including features generally

directed toward: 1) a first memory for storing image data, 2) a second memory for storing image forming conditions, and 3) an image output unit for printing the image data stored in the first memory under the image forming conditions stored in the second memory, together with the other claimed features.

For example, the Examiner relies upon the key buffer 41 disclosed in *Hirata* for a disclosure of a second memory for storing image forming conditions. As amended above, Claims 1, 10, 16 and 19 define that the image forming conditions are selected from the group consisting of: number of copies, magnification, and paper size. However, as disclosed in *Hirata*, the characters are generated by typing on the keyboard 10, the characters are saved in the key buffer 41, and then saved together as a text file in the text memory 47, and multiple text files are saved in the print data memory 45 from which they are printed. That is, the key buffer 41 stores key code data that together forms text data for printing. At least because key code data is not image forming conditions as defined by the claims, Applicants submit that it would not have been obvious to modify *Hirata* to include the same, and hence, Claims 1, 10, 16 and 19 are patentable thereover.

Second, as noted above, the key buffer 41 saves character data, not image forming conditions. Therefore, *Hirata's* text files are not printed under image forming conditions that are stored in the key buffer 41. Thus, as relied on in the Official Action, *Hirata* does not disclose printing or output of image data that is stored in a first memory under image forming conditions that are stored in a second memory, as defined by the claims, and Claims 1, 10, 16 and 19 are allowable.

Claims 4, 6, 9, 11-13, 17 and 18 are allowable at least by virtue of their dependence from allowable independent claims, and because they define features

that further distinguish over the cited disclosures. For example, Claims 6-8, 12 and 14 refer to an image reader for reading an image from an original and acquiring image data. The Examiner proposes that it would have been obvious to modify *Hirata* to include the scanner referred to in *Ohta*. However, *Hirata* is directed to typing text, and more specifically, ensuring that there is no "lag time" between keying the data and the displaying of data on the screen. Therefore, there would have been no motivation to include a scanner (i.e., scanned images) in *Hirata*, as such would serve no purpose. For at least this reason, it would not have been obvious to modify *Hirata* in view of *Ohta* as suggested in the Official Action, and Claims 6-8 and 12-14 are allowable.

The Examiner also rejects Claims 7, 8, 14 and 15 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Hirata* in view of *Ohta*, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,152,001, hereinafter *Hanamoto*.

As relied upon in the Official Action, *Hanamoto* does not satisfy the deficiencies of the rejections of Claims 1, 10 and 16, from which Claims 7, 8, 14 and 15 depend. Therefore, Claims 7, 8, 14 and 15 are allowable for at least the same reasons.

For at least the reasons stated above, it is requested that all the rejections be withdrawn, and that this application be allowed in a timely manner.

In the event that there are any questions concerning this response, or the application in general, the Examiner is respectfully urged to telephone the undersigned attorney so that prosecution of the application may be expedited.

Respectfully submitted,

BURNS, DOANE, SWECKER & MATHIS, L.L.P.

Date: June 7, 2005

By: Kevin B. McGoff (Rn. 53,217)
William C. Rowland
Registration No. 30,888

P.O. Box 1404
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1404
(703) 836-6620